

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6 and 15 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application, and Claims 4, 5 and 7 - 14 were previously cancelled.

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-3 and 6 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended and Claim 16 has been added. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 6, 15 and 16 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-3, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okazaki* (U.S. Patent No. 5,670,797) in view of *Sekiguchi* (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,327), *Siwinski* (U.S. Patent 6,814,642) and *Clock* (U.S. 3,305,745).

Claim 1 is directed to a display panel.

In relevant part, Claim 1 recites:

“.... a display panel including a substrate on which a plurality of display devices is formed, and a protective film formed directly on both the substrate and the plurality of display devices for protecting the plurality of display devices; and
a flexible touch panel which (a) is composed of plastic films, (b) is directly bonded to a whole face of the display panel with an adhesive layer in between, and (c) detects contact with a suitable contact element thereon,
wherein,
the adhesive layer is in direct contact with both the protective film and one of the plastic films,
each of the plurality of the display devices has an organic emitting layer and is made of organic electro luminescence material,
the protective film seals the organic emitting layer, and
the display panel is sealed of the flexible touch panel.”

That is, a flexible touch panel is directly bonded to a whole face of a display panel with an adhesive layer in between. The adhesive layer is in direct contact with both a protective film and one of the plastic films. The protective film is formed directly on both a substrate and the plurality of display devices for protecting the plurality of display devices. One important result of this configuration of the claimed display unit is that no sealing substrate is required, because the flexible touch panel seals the display device. Another important result is that this claimed

display unit has a weight and a thickness that are lighter and thinner than those of any combination of the references cited by the Examiner.

This is clearly unlike *Okazaki*, *Sekiguchi*, *Siwinski* and *Clock*, taken singly or in combination with each other.

The Examiner acknowledges that *Okazaki* fails to teach a display unit that combines the display panel with a flexible touch panel, which is directly bonded to a whole face of the display panel with an adhesive layer in between so as to be in direct contact with both the protective film and one of the plastic films of the touch panel. The Examiner further advances that *Sekiguchi* teaches a display unit comprising a display panel 4, including a substrate 6 on which a display device is formed (with the input panel attached thereto) combined with a touch panel 3, which is bonded to a whole face of the display panel 4 with an adhesive layer 44 therebetween.

However, *Sekiguchi* merely teaches a combination of an LCD display panel 4 with a touch panel 3, rather than an LED display unit in combination with a touch panel. Further, because *Sekiguchi* discloses an LCD display panel to be combined the touch panel, the substrate 1 is inherently required to seal the liquid crystal layer 15. As shown in FIG. 4 of *Sekiguchi*, a first substrate 1 and a second substrate 6, made up of a glass sheet of 0.5 mm thick, respectively, are coupled with a predetermined gap provided therebetween by a sealing member 16, and a liquid crystal layer 15 is formed by filling the gap with liquid crystal. Therefore, in *Sekiguchi*, the display panel 4 of the LCD display unit requires the substrate 1 to protect elements of the display panel 4, such as the electrodes 2 and 7, the liquid crystal layer 15, among others, and to be bonded to the touch panel 3 with the adhesive layer 44. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Sekiguchi* fails to teach or suggest the adhesive layer is in direct contact with both the protective film of a display panel and one of the plastic films of a touch panel, with the protective film being formed directly on both the substrate and the plurality of display devices of the display panel for protecting the plurality of display devices, as required by Claim 1.

Moreover, *Okazaki* teaches that in column 5, lines 62 - 65, that (emphasis added):

“This light-emitting device 10 is provided with an insulating substrate 17 of an oblong shape and an LED (Light-Emitting Diode) chip 14 that is disposed on the insulating substrate 17.”

That is, *Okazaki* discloses an LED (electroluminescence) device, but fails to teach or suggest that the device is made of an organic material, as required by Claim 1.

In addition, *Clock* is relied upon by the Examiner because he discloses that the protective film of the light -emitting device include at least inorganic material. However, this protective film feature is now moot in view of its cancellation. Moreover, *Clock* discloses that the electroluminescent structure is formed of a phosphor luminescent material, rather than an organic material, as required by Claim 1. See at least column 2, lines 25 - 35.

Thus, for at least the above-discussed reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are dependent Claims 2, 3, 6, and 15, for at least the same reasons.

Newly added Claim 16, which is dependent on Claim 1, is also patentable over the cited references, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this claim rejection be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1-3, 6, 15 and 16 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

If the claims are not found to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to schedule an interview before the mailing of the Office Action. Any communication initiated by this paragraph should be deemed an Applicant initiated interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 6, 2009

By: /Kader Gacem/
Kader Gacem
Patent Agent, Registration No. 52,474
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000